REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments in the Final Office Action dated May 24, 2004 and the Advisory Action dated November 03, 2004, which have
5   greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

Claims 1-35 are pending in the present application. Claims 20, 24, and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been entered. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-35 are patentable and should be allowed. Allowance of the Claims is respectfully
10 requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being
15 unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,553,341 to Mullaly (hereinafter "Mullaly") in view of International Publication No. WO92/17838, PCT/EP/91/01642 to Diehl et al. (hereinafter "Diehl"). Applicants respectfully submit that Mullaly and Diehl, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed.

20 Independent Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30 recite respectively a method, system, and/or computer program product for transforming and canonicalizing semantically structured data, comprising *inter alia*, applying text patterns to the obtained data and placing the data in a first data file. Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30 further recite generating grammatical sentences or phrases from the obtained data according to a specific user
25 interface (Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30), the generated grammatical phrases being in a second format associated with the specific user interface (Claims 20, 24, and 30).

The Office Action states that Mullaly and Diehl teach each and every element of independent Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30. Applicants respectfully disagree.
30

- 8 -

Mullaly fails to teach or suggest applying text patterns to the obtained data and placing the data in a first data file, as claimed in Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30. At most, in Figure 5, and at col. 7, lines 27-60, Mullaly discloses a message filter that determines a disposition for the received message, including whether or not the message is

5 announced and what settings to apply to the announcement. See col. 7, lines 20-26.

Furthermore, the Office Action states, at page 3, that Mullaly fails to teach or suggest a method, system, and/or computer program product for transforming and canonicalizing semantically structured data, comprising inter alia, generating grammatical sentences or

10 phrases from the obtained data according to a specific user interface (Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30), the generated grammatical phrases being in a second format associated with the specific user interface (Claims 20, 24, and 30).

Diehl does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Mullaly. Diehl discloses a method for

15 specifying user interfaces and a programming system running a multiple user interface type computer. See Abstract.

Diehl fails to teach or suggest a method, system, and/or computer program product for transforming and canonicalizing semantically structured data, comprising inter alia,

20 applying text patterns to the obtained data and placing the data in a first data file, as claimed in Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30. Diehl further fails to teach or suggest generating grammatical sentences or phrases from the obtained data according to a specific user interface (Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30), the generated grammatical phrases being in a second format associated with the specific user interface (Claims 20,

25 24, and 30). At most, in the cited portions of Diehl, Diehl teaches a specific implementation of user interfaces and integrated facilities, such as ability to switch dynamically between different user interface types.

Furthermore, Mullaly fails to teach or suggest a combination with Diehl, and Diehl fails

30 to teach or suggest a combination with Mullaly. Mullaly is concerned with filtering of

- 9 -

email messages and with transforming announcement text containing text from the filtered messages into synthesized speech and does not contemplate generating grammatical sentences from the obtained data according to a specific user interface, while Diehl discloses support of multiple user interface types by a programming system,

5   but does not contemplate generation of grammatical sentences or phrases from the obtained data according to a specific user interface. It would be impermissible hindsight based on Applicants' own disclosure to combine the teachings of Diehl into Mullaly and to arrive at the present invention as claimed. Moreover, such a combination would still fail to teach or suggest a method, system, and/or computer program product for

10   transforming and canonicalizing semantically structured data, comprising *inter alia*, generating grammatical sentences or phrases from the obtained data according to a specific user interface (Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30), the generated grammatical phrases being in a second format associated with the specific user interface (Claims 20, 24, and 30).

15

Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30 are thus distinguishable over Mullaly and Diehl, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claims 2-13, 15-19, 21-23, 25-29, and 31-35, dependent directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1, 14, 20, 24, and 30, respectively, are also distinguishable

20   over Mulally and Diehl, taken alone or in combination, and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

- 10 -

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants consider the claimed invention to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants earnestly solicit the Examiner's withdrawal of the

5   rejections raised in the above referenced Final Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States Patent.

Respectfully Submitted,

10

Florin Corie

Reg. No. 46,244

Customer No. 22862

-11-